

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/642,846	SELLERS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tiffany A. Fetzner	2859	

All Participants:
Status of Application: After-final

 (1) Tiffany A. Fetzner.

(3) _____.

 (2) Joseph M. Butscher Reg. No. 48,326.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 July 2005
Time: 8:30 am
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

All pending claims and the significance that the word "consisting of" meaning only the components recited in the claim after the words "consisting of" with no other components.

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative to discuss the wording of "consisting of" versus "consisting of only" to ensure that the claim language recited in the after-final amendment of July 11th 2005 was clear, and that in applicant's invention the damping viscoelastic layer is made of only foam, rubber, or foam and rubber. Applicant's attorney verified that the after-final language was simply more concise and that the wording of "consisting of" at least one of foam or rubber, automatically included foam, rubber, or foam and rubber while excluding any other elements. By using "consisting of" as opposed to "comprising" applicant's after-final claim as amended overcomes the prior art of Edelstein et al., because the use of cement within the viscoelastic layer of Edelstein's foam/rubber/cement layer is outside the scope of applicant's invention, which achieves acoustic damping between to separate gradient coil assemblies without requiring the use of cement which makes the assembly unnecessarily heavy.